UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/764,184 | 01/23/2004 | Roy Meaney | 16356.850 (DC-05216) | 7845 |

27683 7590 01/16/2008

HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP
901 Main Street
Suite 3100
Dallas, TX 75202

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| ROSEN, NICHOLAS D | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 3625 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 01/16/2008 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10/764,184 | MEANEY ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Nicholas D. Rosen | 3625 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 January 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) *1-8* is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *9-12* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *13 and 14* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *23 January 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *6/28/2004 and 1/17/2006*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

**DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1-14 have been examined.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 9, 10, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amberg et al. (GB 2 353 373 A) in view of the Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary, and official notice. As per claim 9, Amberg discloses a method of building an information handling system (IHS) to conform to a custom order (Abstract; page 5, lines 6-15), comprising: deriving a system trackcode from a custom order (page 8, lines 6-15); associating the system trackcode with component identifiers in a

database (page 8, lines 6-33); powering up the IHS after building the IHS (implied by page 6, lines 22-29); and retrieving the component identifier and the system trackcode by means of manufacturing software (Figures 3A and 3B; page 9, lines 1-19; page 10, lines 1-12). Amberg does not disclose writing the system trackcode to a CMOS in the IHS, but the Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary teaches computers having CMOS's storing parameter values for the computers (page 95, definition of CMOS, sense 2), implying that the information would have to have been written to the CMOS's at some point. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of manufacturing at the time of applicant's invention to write the system trackcode to a CMOS in the IHS, for the obvious and implied advantage of storing needed parameter values in the CMOS.

Amberg discloses the manufacturing system later reading the system trackcode (e.g., page 18, lines 5-10), although not from the IHS. However, given storing parameter values in the CMOS of a computer (IHS), as taught by the Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary, it would have been obvious to read data from the IHS, as an obvious reason to store the data in the first place, and for the obvious advantage of assuring that a particular IHS was the build-to-order IHS a customer had ordered.

Amberg does not disclose scanning a hardware component to derive a component identifier, but official notice is taken that it is well known to scan items to derive their identifiers (e.g., scanning barcodes). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of manufacturing at the time of applicant's invention to

scan a hardware component to derive a component identifier, for the obvious advantage of making the obtaining and/or entry of component identifiers rapid and automatic.

As per claim 10, Amberg discloses generating a unique identifier associated with the trackcode (page 8, lines 6-15); this can be called a HW SIG.

As per claim 11, Amberg discloses retrieving the trackcode from the database (e.g., page 18, lines 5-10), and discloses generating a current HW SIG (page 28, lines 28-33).

As per claim 12, Amberg discloses retrieving what can be a current HW SIG (page 18, lines 5-10); powering up is implied as noted in the rejection of claim 8 above.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 1-8 are allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: The closest prior art of record, Mukherjee et al. (EP 0 520 923 A2), discloses a method of manufacturing an item of build-to-order equipment having at least one hardware component bearing an identifier ("component ID"), comprising: generating a digital identifier ("system trackcode") which defines the configuration of the item (Abstract; Figures 4 and 5; column 5, line 42, through column 6, line 54). Other prior art is similarly relevant, e.g., Amberg et al. (GB 2 353 373 A), which is concerned with a build-to-order computer system (see especially page 8, lines 6-33). Neither Mukherjee, Amberg, nor any other prior art of record discloses storing the system trackcode in association with the component ID in a non-specific external storage medium such that

the component ID can be used as a key to retrieve the associated system trackcode; and at least at one stage of manufacture reading the component ID from the one component and using it too retrieve the associated system trackcode from the external storage medium. It is well known to read information (as by scanning a barcode, or simply by reading, e.g., a printed or engraved number on a component), and it is known to store information and use it to retrieve related information, as taught, for example, by Chen et al. (U.S. Patent 7,073,050) (see especially column 4, lines 29-36; column 5, lines 48-59; column 7, lines 14-25). However, Chen discloses gathering and maintaining information on the various components of a piece of equipment; neither Chen nor any other prior art of record discloses, teaches, or reasonably suggests reading the component ID from a component and using it to retrieve the system trackcode (identifier) for an item of equipment whose includes the component.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Claims 13 and 14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The closest prior art of record, Amberg et al. (GB 2 353 373 A), discloses

several limitations of claims 9-12, as set forth above; others are obvious in view of the Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary and official notice. However, neither Amberg any other prior art of record nor retrieving the unique HW SIG from the database using the trackcode; and comparing the unique identifier HW SIG against the current HW SIG. It is known to compare present and earlier versions of a file, but this is not held to be sufficient to make the particulars of claim 13 obvious, given a lack of teaching in Amberg or any other analogous art of record to perform such a comparison of HW SIG's.

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Mukherjee et al. (U.S. Patent 5,311,424) disclose a method and system for product configuration definition and tracking. Nagaoka (U.S. Patent 5,586,038) discloses a manufacturing history management system. Ushiki (U.S. Patent 6,006,203) discloses an order control apparatus capable of reducing input operation by an input unit. Charlton et al. (U.S. Patent 6,161,052) disclose a method for identifying a component with physical characterization. Thiel et al. (U.S. Patent 6,381,509) disclose automatic manufacturing monitoring and tracking. Chen et al. (U.S. Patent 7,073,050) disclose a method and system for reporting configuration data for queriable and non-queriable installed components.

O'Connor (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0091456) discloses a process for configuring software and hardware in a build-to-order computer system.

Noda et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0172159) disclose an ID information managing system and apparatus. Hoppes et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0249606) disclose an infinitely variable, order specific, holistic assembly process control system.

Dahlback et al., "Bar Code Aids Volvo's Drive for Quality Customization" (abstract only), discloses using auto ID to track customized vehicles through the production line. The anonymous article, "Safewww Launches Authentication System," discloses hardware signatures (in a different context) for Internet security. The anonymous article, "Upgraded Tracking Tool," discloses an item-tracking application.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas D. Rosen, whose telephone number is 571-272-6762. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey A. Smith, can be reached on 571-272-6763. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Non-official/draft communications can be faxed to the examiner at 571-272-6762.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nicholas D. Rosen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3625

January 15, 2008